

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	OBESITY PREVALENCE AMONG HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS IN ENGLAND: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY USING THE HEALTH SURVEY FOR ENGLAND
AUTHORS	Kyle, Richard; wills, jane; Mahoney, Catherine; Hoyle, Louise; Kelly, Muireann; Atherton, Iain

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Gael Janine Mearns Auckland University of Technology, Auckland New Zealand None
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Jul-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This research builds on knowledge from a similar study of Scottish health care professionals and non-health workers. Robust rationale is provided for the study and the authors are very clear about the new knowledge that this study adds.</p> <p>Abstract: Reword the concluding statement "High obesity prevalence among health care professionals is concerning...". Non-nurse health professionals in this study had a much lower than national average prevalence, so the abstract conclusion should just refer to the high prevalence in nurses and unregistered care workers. Unregistered care workers do not fit the WHO definition for a health professional so should not be grouped as health professionals.</p> <p>Methods: Write beside citation 7 that methods for collection of height and weight measures are published elsewhere.</p> <p>Results: The statistics on overweight are reported in the table but not discussed in the manuscript text. There are significant differences in overweight prevalence so it seems appropriate that mention is made of these in the written text.</p> <p>Statistics: More detail is needed on sensitivity analysis and the weightings used in analysis.</p> <p>Originality: The format of the abstract is very close to the Kyle et al, Int J Nurs Stud 53, 126-133. 2015 Oct 27 article and needs a more original format. Occasional other excerpts are also very close in wording and need rewriting.</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>Standard of written English:</p> <p>This is a well-written manuscript.</p> <p>Page 9 - 10 need some editing.</p> <p>Page 9, line 5 'reflecting'- should read 'reflect'</p> <p>Page 9, line 8 -needs rewording.</p> <p>Page 10, line 7 – 19. The sentence is 71 words long. Edit it.</p> <p>Page 10, line 19 – 30. The sentence is too long (52 words). Edit it.</p> <p>Page 10, line 30 – 41. The sentence is too long and needs editing.</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	<p>Julia Roncoroni</p> <p>Department of Counseling Psychology, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver, USA</p> <p>None</p>
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Jul-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Intro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - p.4, lines 6-13: The authors might want to do away with quotations when citing government reports, and cite without quoting instead. - p.4, lines 26-27: The “impact of obesity on an ageing nursing workforce” is poorly stated and somewhat disconnected from other content in the paragraph. - Although the research question is stated, it is not well framed. From prior literature cited in the introduction, it seems like it is clear how many nurses are overweight and obese (p.4, lines 9-10). The rationale for conducting the study should be expanded. As it stands, it is unclear how this study adds to the existing literature. <p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study Design and Participants: It is not clear why, if the HSE includes adults over the age of 16, only “participants aged 17-65” were included in the study. This should be specified. - Measures: avoid 1 sentence paragraphs (p.5, line 25) - Statistical Methods: Generally good description of statistical analyses. It is unclear how “socio-demographic variables (i.e., gender and age) that might explain differences in prevalence” were selected. <p>Results are clearly stated.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The first paragraph of the Discussion is not cohesive. It is unclear what the main point of the paragraph is. - The results regarding obesity and age first introduced in paragraph 2 of the Discussion should be presented earlier (in the Results section). - The third paragraph of the Discussion section (“Prevalence of obesity... as nurses (8).”) also needs further cohesiveness. - Although the points under implications make some sense, they are not direct implications of the study. Some of the points made under implications are probably better suited for the Introduction of the paper as they don't stem from the study but make it worth conducting. - Limitations: It would probably be good to acknowledge limitation of BMI as a measure of obesity. <p>Conclusions are well stated.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1: Gael Janine Mearns

This research builds on knowledge from a similar study of Scottish health care professionals and non-health workers. Robust rationale is provided for the study and the authors are very clear about the new knowledge that this study adds.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for this supportive comment about the study's rigour and originality.

Abstract

Comment: Reword the concluding statement "High obesity prevalence among health care professionals is concerning...". Non-nurse health professionals in this study had a much lower than national average prevalence, so the abstract conclusion should just refer to the high prevalence in nurses and unregistered care workers. Unregistered care workers do not fit the WHO definition for a health professional so should not be grouped as health professionals.

Response: The concluding statement of the Abstract has been revised as requested while adhering to the journal guidelines.

Methods

Comment: Write beside citation 7 that methods for collection of height and weight measures are published elsewhere.

Response: This has been added as requested.

Results

Comment: The statistics on overweight are reported in the table but not discussed in the manuscript text. There are significant differences in overweight prevalence so it seems appropriate that mention is made of these in the written text.

Response: We have added reference to prevalence of obesity in the Results section as requested.

Statistics

Comment: More detail is needed on sensitivity analysis and the weightings used in analysis.

Response: We have added further information about weights used and referred to NatCen documentation as requested.

Originality

Comment: The format of the abstract is very close to the Kyle et al, Int J Nurs Stud 53, 126-133. 2015 Oct 27 article and needs a more original format. Occasional other excerpts are also very close in wording and need rewriting.

Response: We have revised the Abstract and other sections of the manuscript as requested.

Standard of written English:

Comment:

This is a well-written manuscript.

Page 9 - 10 need some editing.

Page 9, line 5 'reflecting'- should read 'reflect' Page 9, line 8 -needs rewording.

Page 10, line 7 – 19. The sentence is 71 words long. Edit it.

Page 10, line 19 – 30. The sentence is too long (52 words). Edit it.

Page 10, line 30 – 41. The sentence is too long and needs editing.

Response: We have edited the manuscript to address each of these points as requested.

Reviewer 2: Julia Roncoroni

Intro

Comments:

- p.4, lines 6-13: The authors might want to do away with quotations when citing government reports, and cite without quoting instead.

- p.4, lines 26-27: The “impact of obesity on an ageing nursing workforce” is poorly stated and somewhat disconnected from other content in the paragraph.

- Although the research question is stated, it is not well framed. From prior literature cited in the introduction, it seems like it is clear how many nurses are overweight and obese (p.4, lines 9-10). The rationale for conducting the study should be expanded. As it stands, it is unclear how this study adds to the existing literature.

Response: We have substantially revised the Introduction in response to this request and similar comments from Reviewer 1.

Methods

Comments:

- Study Design and Participants: It is not clear why, if the HSE includes adults over the age of 16, only “participants aged 17-65” were included in the study. This should be specified.

Response: We have added a rationale for the selection of the age range used in the study as requested.

Measures: avoid 1 sentence paragraphs (p.5, line 25)

Response: We have revised this paragraph to avoid a one sentence paragraph as requested.

Statistical Methods: Generally good description of statistical analyses. It is unclear how “socio-demographic variables (i.e., gender and age) that might explain differences in prevalence” were selected.

Response: We have added a rationale for the selection of gender and age as requested.

Results are clearly stated.

Response: No response required.

Discussion

Comments:

- The first paragraph of the Discussion is not cohesive. It is unclear what the main point of the paragraph is.
- The results regarding obesity and age first introduced in paragraph 2 of the Discussion should be presented earlier (in the Results section).
- The third paragraph of the Discussion section ("Prevalence of obesity... as nurses (8).") also needs further cohesiveness.
- Although the points under implications make some sense, they are not direct implications of the study. Some of the points made under implications are probably better suited for the Introduction of the paper as they don't stem from the study but make it worth conducting.
- Limitations: It would probably be good to acknowledge limitation of BMI as a measure of obesity.

Response: We have substantially revised the Discussion to address each of these points as requested.

Comment: Conclusions are well stated.

Response: No response required.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to resubmit this paper. I look forward to hearing the outcome of your Editorial deliberations.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr Gael Mearns Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand
REVIEW RETURNED	31-Aug-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	All required amendments made.
-------------------------	-------------------------------

REVIEWER	Julia Roncoroni, PhD Department of Counseling Psychology University of Denver
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Aug-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	Authors have edited the manuscript based on the prior review. The latest draft looks much improved.
-------------------------	---